

Individual Technical Evaluation Document - Ratings Summary Page

IT Enterprise-wide Systems Support

Vendor: AVERAGECORP

Evaluator:

| Category | Evaluation Sub Factor | Rating |
|---|--|------------------|
| Management Approach and Technical Capabilities | 1. Understanding of the work, including creativity and thoroughness shown in understanding the objectives of the SOW and specific tasks, and planned execution of the project. | S |
| | 2. Evidence of specific methods and techniques for completing each discrete task, to include such items as quality assurance, and customer-service. | VG |
| | 3. Ability to address anticipated potential problem areas, and creativity and feasibility of solutions to problems and future integration of new processes and technology enhancements. | S |
| | 4. Degree to which the offerors proposal demonstrates an understanding of logistics, schedule, and any other issues the Government should be aware of. | S |
| | 5. Quality and effectiveness of the allocation of personnel and resources. | VG |
| | Overall Management Approach and Technical Capabilities | S |
| Personnel Qualifications | 1. The currency, quality and depth of experience of individual personnel in working on similar projects. Similar projects must convey similarity in topic, dollar value, workload, duration, and complexity. | S |
| | 2. Quality and depth of education and experience on other projects which may not be similar enough to include in response to #1. (Immediately above) but may be relevant. | S |
| | 3. The currency, quality and depth of how the Project Director will supervise and coordinate the workforce. | S |
| | Overall Personnel Qualifications | S |
| Organizational Experience | 1. Evidence that the organization has current capabilities; and for assuring performance of this requirement. Evidence of supporting subcontractors, consultants and business partners will be considered. | S |
| | 2. Appropriate mix and balance of education and training of team members. | S |
| | Overall Organizational Experience | S |
| Past Performance | 1. The organizations history of successful completion of projects; history of producing high-quality reports and other deliverables; history of staying on schedule and within budget. | E |
| | 2. The quality of cooperation (with each other) of key individuals within your organization, and quality of cooperation and performance between your organization and its clients. | Not able to rate |
| | 3. The organization's specific past performance on prior similar efforts specified within this SOW. | Not able to rate |
| | Overall Past Performance | S |
| Summary | Overall Technical Rating (Moderate Risk) | S |

Vendor Name: AVERAGECORP**Evaluator Name:**

| Management Approach and Technical Capabilities | | |
|---|--------------|---|
| Evaluation Sub Factors | | |
| 1. Understanding of the work, including creativity and thoroughness shown in understanding the objectives of the SOW and specific tasks, and planned execution of the project. | Strengths | AVERAGECORP seems to understand the objectives and tasks of SOW and have outlined the points of critical importance in meeting the objectives. They've laid out their philosophy and approach which are good. |
| | Weaknesses | Not clear on how their smaller scale methodologies will translate to an enterprise approach. |
| | Deficiencies | |
| 2. Evidence of specific methods and techniques for completing each discrete task, to include such items as quality assurance, and customer-service. | Strength | Quality assurance portion very well thought through and delineates. The specific methods and techniques were outlined in some detail. |
| | Weaknesses | But strategies were vague |
| | Deficiencies | |
| 3. Ability to address anticipated potential problem areas; and creativity and feasibility of solutions to problems and future integration of new processes and technology enhancements. | Strengths | Appears AVERAGECORP has thought through various processes to ensure flexibility in meeting potential problem areas or where a need for flexibility might occur. They have put identified very important procedural and collaborative processes that if adhered to would help alleviate, eliminate or, at the very least, facilitate addressing any problem before or after it arises. |
| | Weaknesses | Their list however does not include specific issues they anticipate based on their experience with organizations. Would have liked to have seen realistic issues that could have been reasonably anticipated. |
| | Deficiencies | |
| Vendor Name: AVERAGECORP Evaluator Name: | | |
| Management Approach and Technical Capabilities (Continued) | | |
| 4. Degree to which the offerors proposal demonstrates an understanding of logistics, schedule, and any other issues the Government should be aware of. | Strengths | Good plan, well thought out, other than schedule. |
| | Weaknesses | Limited discussion of possible scheduling issues or associated risk mitigation strategies. |
| | Deficiencies | |
| 5. Quality and effectiveness of the allocation of personnel and resources. | Strengths | |
| | Weaknesses | Allocation of resources was provided in general terms of roles – not specifics on hours. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Deficiencies | |
| Overall summary of Management Approach and Technical Capabilities | They've outlined a good approach to the overall objectives, the various phases of the task and seem to understand the project objectives, they've articulated how work progress and quality will be evaluated and they have articulated process that, if adhered to, it could avoid or address most problems. Weak on discussion of schedule risks or allocation of resources. | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Vendor Name: AVERAGECORP | | Evaluator Name: |
| Personnel Qualifications | | |
| Evaluation Sub Factor | | |
| 1. The currency, quality and depth of experience of individual personnel in working on similar projects. Similar projects must convey similarity in topic, dollar value, workload, duration, and complexity. | Strengths | Although projects are related and the skills needed for our project would <u>probably</u> transfer. |
| | Weaknesses | Projects are related but not similar in scale. My concern is that AVERAGECORP's experience with smaller projects may not transfer to our enterprise-wide objectives.. |
| | Deficiencies | |
| 2. Quality and depth of education and experience on other projects which may not be similar enough to include in response to #1. (Immediately above) but may be relevant. | Strengths | AVERAGECORP – the 2 key staff – have been working on projects that are not similar to ours. Good experience just not directly related to our project. |
| | Weaknesses | Educational background of the two key staff (in Mechanical Engineering and Business Management) do not completely align with our needs. |
| | Deficiencies | |
| 3. The currency, quality and depth of how the Project Director will supervise and coordinate the workforce. | Strengths | Adequate discussion of Project Director's role. |
| | Weaknesses | |
| | Deficiencies | |
| Overall summary for Personnel Qualifications | The two key staff have adequate qualifications, although a significant amount is of the "transferrable" type rather than specific to our project. | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Vendor Name: | | Evaluator Name: |
| Organizational Experience | | |
| Evaluation Sub Factor | | |
| 1. Evidence that the organization has current capabilities; and for assuring performance of this requirement. Evidence of supporting subcontractors, consultants and business partners will be considered. | Strengths | AVERAGECORP's work experience on smaller projects is such that one could assume they "probably" could do the work of our project. |
| | Weaknesses | There is a risk in "could assume they probably could do the work". That is very different than saying – I know they can do this – they've done it before. |
| | Deficiencies | |
| 2. Appropriate mix and balance of education and training of team members. | Strengths | |
| | Weaknesses | Education and training of key staff is not what we would normally be looking for – Business Management & Mechanical Engineering. |
| | Deficiencies | |
| Overall summary for Organizational Experience | They probably could do a fine job on this project but that's assuming skills and experience would transfer to our project. If there is another team that has more direct experience, I would be far more likely to consider them. | |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Vendor Name: AVERAGECORP | | Evaluator Name: |
| Past Performance | | |
| Evaluation Sub Factor | | |
| 1. The organizations history of successful completion of projects; history of producing high-quality reports and other deliverables; history of staying on schedule and within budget. | Strengths | Appears that AVERAGECORP has been very successful in providing quality results – and according to their own accounts – staying on schedule & within budget. |
| | Weaknesses | |
| | Deficiencies | |
| 2. The quality of cooperation (with each other) of key individuals within your organization, and quality of cooperation and performance between your organization and its clients. | Strengths | Not enough information to assess. |
| | Weaknesses | |
| | Deficiencies | |
| 3. The organization's specific past performance on prior similar efforts specified within this SOW. | Strengths | |
| | Weaknesses | None of the projects similar enough to evaluate as similar. |
| | Deficiencies | |
| Overall summary for Past Performance | AVERAGECORP has worked on smaller projects with apparently successful results. They clearly have innovate ways of approaching their work. Still the concern is that their expertise and capability is just not exactly aligned with our project. | |

Evaluation Summary

Vendor Name: **AVERAGECORP**

**Overall
Summary of
contractor's
technical
proposal**

AVERAGECORP has a lot of strengths – the quality of their experience and approach to their work projects – their creativity in developing solutions. However, they have not demonstrated their ability to manage and execute a project with as wide a scope as ours. Could they do our project? Probably. But it wouldn't be without moderate risk as they transfer their expertise and experience.
Also of concern is the education and background of the two lead personnel.

Overall Rating: Satisfactory

Evaluator Name and Signature:

Date:

Technical Evaluation Rating Definitions

Ensure the Ratings Match the Strength & Weakness Narrative

| Rating | Abbreviation | Risk Level | Definition |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------------------|---|
| Excellent | E | Very Low Risk | The proposal contains no deficiencies or weaknesses. Based on information provided, there is no doubt that the offeror demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the services required to meet or exceed most contract requirements. The highest quality of contract performance is anticipated. |
| Very Good | VG | Low Risk | The proposal contains no deficiencies and only a few minor weaknesses that do not require discussions. Based on the information provided, there is little doubt that the offeror demonstrates a high quality of understanding of the services required to meet or exceed some contract requirements. |
| Satisfactory | S | Moderate Risk | The proposal contains no deficiencies and some weaknesses. Based on the information provided, the Offeror demonstrates an understanding of the services required to meet contract requirements. |
| Poor | P | High Risk | The proposal contains deficiencies and significant weaknesses. Based on information provided, there is doubt that the contractor understands the services required to meet the contract requirements. Requirement/services can be met only with major changes to the proposal. |
| Unacceptable | U | Unacceptable Risk | Technical proposal has many deficiencies and/or gross omissions; failure to understand much of the scope of work necessary to perform the required tasks; failure to provide a reasonable, logical approach to fulfilling much of the government's requirements; failure to meet many personnel requirements in the solicitation. (When applying this adjective to a proposal as a whole, the technical proposal would have to be so unacceptable in one or more areas that it would have to be completely revised in order to attempt to make it other than unacceptable.) |